



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

breaks in other letters of Paul. He tries to show that the break is not absolute and argues for a close sequence in the epistle from first to last in the order the parts lie before us.

"The Latin Prologues of John" (B. W. Bacon in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXII, Part III [September, 1913], 194-217).

The author's interest is with the Codex Toletanus, a Spanish manuscript of the tenth century which has two prologues to John, the first being a common or monarchian one and the second having the heading "Inspid Prologus Secundus." The first two-thirds of this second prologue to T are parallel to the first part of the chapter of *De Viris Illustribus*, which in H θ Benedictus constitutes the prologue of Jerome. The last third of T2b is parallel to the fourth form of prologue known as Reginensis and Stuttgartensis. Burkitt argues that this second prologue of T is the original source from which Jerome and Reginensis have drawn, basing his argument on a comparison of the two parallels, thus making the Prologus Secundus of great historical value. He concludes that this second prologue of T gives the earliest form known to us of a very remarkable theory as to the origin of the Fourth Gospel. Bacon argues, to the contrary, that the compound is derived from its two factors and then narrows his interest in T2b, the Greco-Latin prologue, the antiquity and value of which is of great concern. This Harnack has proved older than Philastrius, Jerome's older contemporary, which would determine its date as not later than 383 A.D.

The writer next turns attention to the questions suggested by Clemen's proposal to regard the testimony of Papias to the Fourth Gospel as authentic, thus "outweighing in importance all the rest of the external evidence put together." Bacon here reviews the judgment of Harnack, Zahn, and Lightfoot on the matter. The deadlock between the critics leads the writer to attempt a new way out. He notes the reasonable concessions which he thinks may be made on either side. On the one hand, something of this nature must have stood in Papias, the clause which actually purports to quote his *Exegesis* not being a pure figment of the imagination. On the other hand, the difficulty must be admitted of accounting for the silence of all the early defenders of the gospel, if Papias' testimony had anything like the form proposed by most modern defenders. Bacon seeks an explanation which solves both difficulties together through a closer scrutiny of the text and bases the conclusion at which he arrives on the universally admitted composite character of the prologue in question.

Here Clement and Lightfoot alone attempt to trace the clause "descripsit vero evangelium dictante Johanne recte," which occurs at the end of the first paragraph in T2b, to anything in Papias, and even they regard it as a mistaken inference. As for the second, anti-Marcionite paragraph, it is rejected by all critics as worthless. This narrows attention to the remaining part in which occurs the statement that Papias declared the Fourth Gospel to have been given out "by John in his lifetime." The argument turns on the meaning of the word *manifestum* (evidently intended for *manifestatum*) which appears in this part. Bacon says there is no warrant for making *manifestare* take the place of *edere* which is the proper synonym for *revelare*, the common equivalent for ἀποκαλύπτειν in ecclesiastical Latin. The Greek translation would be ἀπεκαλύφη και ἐξεδόθη ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (ταῖς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ). Bacon thus arrives at his solution of the twofold difficulty, that this statement refers not to the Gospel but to the Revelation of John. If attached as a note in any manuscript it must have stood between the two, the two writings being in some respects adjacent; and while intended

as an epilogue to Revelation, it was transcribed as a prologue to the Gospel. This would mean that Papias' testimony was rather that the Apocalypse was "revealed to John" and given out by him to the churches of Asia. The writer proceeds to substantiate this conclusion, arguing, on the one hand, the likelihood and probability that Papias should have so testified concerning the Apocalypse, and on the other hand, the anachronism of making Papias a participant in the controversies which arose as to the authorship of the Gospel.

"The Genealogies of Jesus" (Henry A. Sanders in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXII, Part III [September, 1913], 184-93).

With reference to the reconciliation and interpretation of the genealogies of Matthew and Luke, the author of the article claims that a new turn has been given to the discussion by the discovery of a notable variant in the form of Matt. 1:16 in the Sinaitic Syriac and related authorities. With the publishing of the Sinaitic in 1894 many scholars seized upon this variant as positive proof that the opposition between the genealogy and birth was irreconcilable and that the latter was a later insertion in the text of Matthew, believing that the Syriac represented the original Matthean text for vs. 16.

The combined evidence of the many passages in all four gospels and in Paul shows that the belief in the virgin birth was undoubtedly held in the church from a very early period. The author accordingly proceeds to attack the genealogies which, though also of ancient tradition, are later insertions by a different author in Matthew and Luke. Holding against Burkitt that the Sinaitic Syriac is an older version, he says it is natural that attempts should be made to smooth over the contradictions between the genealogies and the divine birth, but that it is difficult on the other hand to see how the changes should be introduced to emphasize it. He cites further evidence based on the omission of these versions in the Old Latin MS 72. The writer also cites evidence for a later insertion in Luke (a) from its omission in the Washington MS of the gospels of the fourth century; (b) supplementary evidence of its absence in the old lectionaries of Matthaei; (c) the sixth-century Greco-Latin MS Dd which gives the genealogy of Matthew in place of the Lukan genealogy, only in the inverted order to agree with the Lukan form and with the addition of the names from Adam to Abraham which Matthew did not give; (d) from the form of the names in the Sinaitic Syriac of which there are two MSS in the Arabic, an older Borgian MS which has the genealogy as an appendix and the younger Vatican MS which includes them as part of the text.

"The Date of the Epistle to the Galatians" (Maurice Jones in the *Expositor*, 8th Series, Vol. VI, No. 33 [September, 1913], 193-208).

The article is evoked by the recent conclusion of Kirsopp Lake ("Earlier Epistles of St. Paul") to the effect that the epistle was written after the first missionary tour on the journey between Antioch and Jerusalem, which theory, old in itself, he supports by new considerations. The difficulty for the writer with this view is to harmonize this early date with the historical accuracy of Acts. He sees (a) that a period of six months (which is the longest period critics assume between the first missionary tour and the journey to Jerusalem) is inadequate to produce the situation and events which the Epistle to the Galatians implies; (b) that the writing of the epistle must be reconciled with Acts 15:3 which implies a most satisfactory outlook in Galatia, if